

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION**

WRIT PETITION NO.3199 OF 2006

Union of India ..Petitioner

V/s.

Anurag Awasthi and ors ..Respondents

Mrs.Neeta V. Masurkar with Ms.Ritu Singh i/b.
Pankaj Kapoor, advocate for the petitioner
Respondent No.5 is present in person

**CORAM : S.B.MHASE &
R.S.MOHITE, JJ.**

DATE : 24TH APRIL, 2007

P.C.

1. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner. The respondents were promoted. However, they were given only seven days time to accept the order. The contention of the respondents is that they were not served. There is no evidence with the petitioner to demonstrate that this order was served on them. O.A. has been allowed to the extent of quashing and debarment. We find that Central Administrative Tribunal has

properly considered this aspect and further passed the order. We also find that the orders of debarment are not annexed even though they know that they are necessary parts of the petition. Therefore, the petitioner is directed to take a decision in respect of the decision taken by the respondents.

2. We do not find that this is a fit case for interference for entertaining under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. The petition is hereby rejected.

(R.S.MOHITE, J.)

(S.B.MHASE, J.)